

Remarks/Arguments

The Office Action dated June 30, 2006, has been noted and its contents carefully studied.

Initially, it is noted that a minor amendment has been made to the claims to refer to “use data” as “collected network transaction data”. Support for this change is found in the last paragraph at page 6 of the specification. It is respectfully urged that the amendment is merely of a clarifying nature for purposes of appeal, clarifies the claims and should be entered. Accordingly, the Examiner’s entry of the amendment is courteously solicited. In any event however, Applicants also wish to advise the Examiner that should the amendment not be entered, if the Examiner still remains unpersuaded concerning the allowability of the application, that Applicants intend to pursue an appeal in this case, and Applicants respectfully urge that the clarifying amendment would more clearly crystallize the issues for appeal and thus, entry is again courteously solicited.

In addition, the Examiner’s indication of allowable subject matter in the form of claims 17, 18, 21 and 27 is gratefully acknowledged. However, Applicants at this time decline to rewrite the claims in independent form because Applicant believes that that other claims are clearly allowable over the art of record, for reasons previously advanced and now restated in part herein.

U.S. Patent No. 6,546,393 to Khan

U.S. Patent No. 6,546,393 to Khan (hereinafter “Khan”), as already noted, discloses a method for generating a prioritized network site directory. While Khan teaches generating a categorized site directory, it is a single user that stores and categorizes the bookmarks on a server for that user. Accordingly, there is nothing in Khan which teaches or suggests the concept as claimed by Applicants where selections are made by a person (web coder) which is separate from a user of a network to arrange for a classification arrangement from collected network transaction data. This is a key distinction.

More specifically, the section of the patent cited by the Examiner at beginning of column 11, clearly states that a user registers with the online bookmark management service and imports their browser bookmarks or favorite lists of an existing web page. It is the user that determines the categories under which to file a bookmark or set of bookmarks for the user's own personal use and there is no teaching or suggestion of having a separate web coder which monitors the resources access by a separate user to result in a categorized list.

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons it is respectfully urged that all of the claims are clearly patentable over the art of record. Nonetheless, should the Examiner still have any comments, questions or suggestions necessary to expedite prosecution of the application or to place the case in condition for allowance, he is courteously requested to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

August 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



A. José Cortina, Reg. No. 29,733
Daniels Danfels & Verdonik, P.A.
P.O. Drawer 12218
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Voice 919.544.5444
Fax 919.544.5920
Email jcortina@d2vlaw.com

Enclosures